

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 22, Reference ATPD Page 12

Paragraph # 3.2.2.1

Title: Dimensions

Statement: “Dimensions shall be defined in accordance with SAE J1100 except for para W103 vehicle width, which is redefined as: the maximum dimension measured between the widest points on the vehicle, excluding mirrors and marker lamps, but including bumpers, moldings, and sheet metal protrusions. The vehicle dimensions for worldwide operation and transportability, shall not exceed those stated in Section 6.” The limit defined in ATPD paragraph 6.3.17 is that the width cannot exceed 96 inches.

Question 22: Is the HIMAR’s launcher exempt from this requirement since it has handholds and antenna bases/mounts attached to the side of the cab which violate the width limitation of 96 inches?

If the HIMAR’s launcher is not exempt from this requirement, will either paragraph 3.2.2.1 or 6.3.17 be revised to exclude safety devices (such as hand holds) and ancillary equipment (such as the antenna mounts) from the criteria that determines vehicle width?

Answer 22: *The handholds and antenna mounts are considered kits and not part of the base vehicle.*

Question 25, Reference ATPD Page 13

Paragraph # 3.2.2.3.3

Title: Corrosion Control Performance

Statement:

There were numerous recommended changes described in the Accelerated Corrosion Durability Test of the FMTV in Attachment 25. Many of these have been incorporated via ECP’s provided for information during the Phase I effort of the program.

Question 25A: Have all the recommended changes proposed in the subject corrosion test report been incorporated into the new TDP provided in this draft RFP?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

If not, and the configuration baseline is in effect frozen, please provide a list of the corrosion enhancements still outstanding that need to be incorporated.

Answer 25A: *Those changes that the Government has elected to incorporate are already reflected in the TDP. No additional changes (Phase II or otherwise) are envisioned at this time.*

Question 25B: If the recommended changes have not been incorporated into the baseline TDP, will these become new Government mandated changes that must be incorporated in the Phase II proposal?

Answer 25B: *No additional changes resulting from the ACT are envisioned at this time.*

Question 41, Reference ATPD, Page 9

Paragraph # 3.2.1.2

Title: Side Slope Operation

Statement: This paragraph describes vehicle operation and stability while on a 30% side slope. There are potential payloads such as fuel/water modules (Ex CAMEL), fuel/water bladders where shifting of the liquid could adversely affect vehicle stability. Since no guidance has been provided on the LHS variant requirements, it is possible that flatrack payloads or potentially ISO containers/shelters could affect stability if the payload vertical Cg were sufficiently high.

Question 41A: Has there been testing to confirm that potential payloads such as water/fuel pods or bladders of liquids do not adversely impact the vehicle stability on a 30% side slope? If testing was performed, can copies of this documentation be provided?

Revised Answer 41A: *Yes, Test Record No: AS-T-115-96 will be provided separately to the Contractors.*

Question 41B: Will the side slope operational limitations for LHS truck and trailer payload be provided? If physical testing has been performed, please provide a copy of this documentation for our review.

Answer 41B: *Side slope requirements have already been incorporated into the spec. There has been no testing conducted for this requirement to date.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 41C: Can testing be conducted without payloads of liquids that can shift and adversely affect vehicle stability to eliminate this test variable?

Answer 41C: *Yes.*

Question 58, Reference Draft RFP Section H, Paragraph # H.9.1.5

Title: Firm-Fixed Price Options for Vehicles Not in Base Quantity

Statement:

Bidders are required to provide firm-fixed pricing for six models of vehicles not in the base quantities. These can be called up in each of the program years.

Question 58: What quantity is each to be based upon?

Answer 58: *Quantities are provided in Attachment 38.*

Question 105, Reference ATPD, Page 108 Paragraph # H.3.3.2

Title: Cold Conditions

Statement:

“For outside temperatures less than -25°F to -50°F, a temperature of at least 60°F shall be obtainable within 60 minutes after the heater is turned on. A kit is allowable to meet this requirement.”

Question 105A:

Has there been any evaluation to confirm that the baseline heater for the LMTV Van either meets or does not meet this requirement?

Answer 105A: *Yes, the heater was successfully tested during PQT (Test Report ATC-7750, Jan 96).*

Question 105B:

If testing has been performed, will the competitors be provided a copy of the test results for review? If so, when would this information be made available?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Answer 105B: *Not required. See response to 105D below.*

Question 105C:

If the baseline heater cannot meet this performance requirement, is there an existing kit that is to be used with the LMTV Van and if so will details be provided to the contractors?

Answer 105C: *Beyond the baseline installation kit (57K1948) there is no supplemental kit for the additional heating requirement.*

Question 105D:

If no information is provided about this kit, are the competitors responsible to develop a kit to meet the Cold Condition requirement?

Answer 105D: *No. If the baseline heater does not provide adequate performance it will be addressed post-award through an STS initiative.*

Question 120, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.1.1.1.4

Title: Drawing/Solid Model

Statement:

C.2.1.1.1.4 "the contractor shall provide a 3D Solid Model Of the affected parts and their assemblies.."

Question 120A:

As in Phase I, can the Government please confirm that 3D solid models will not be required for fasteners, fittings, hoses, harnesses, and other miscellaneous small parts with the Phase II proposal submittal?

Answer 120A: *Yes. The Government agrees that 3-D solid models for fasteners, fittings, miscellaneous small parts will not have to be submitted with the Phase II proposal. Exceptions may be made where Contractor ECPs introduce new harnesses, hoses or other non-standard parts that resulted in Phase I TIRs or those components have been modified for Phase II.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 120B:

Are solid models required for changes which do not affect component appearance, i.e. torque change, note change, material finish, etc.?

Answer 120B: *Yes, except as noted in 120A above.*

Question 131, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.10.6

Title: Production Verification Test (PVT) Training

Statement:

Paragraph C.2.10.6.1 states: "The Contractor shall provide 2 technically qualified instructors to support required training at each of the below listed Government PVT test sites:

- a. Aberdeen Test Center (ATC), MD.
- b. White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), NM."

Paragraph F.1 lists four model specific PVTs.

Question 131A:

Is training required for each of the four model specific PVTs? In other words, are there to be four separate PVT training classes at the start of each PVT?

Answer 131A:

Yes, there will be 4 different classes at each site, 1 as each group of trucks arrives, 2 months apart. Statement of work will be updated in the Final RFP.

Question 131B:

What are the dates/DAC for when the training is to be initiated and completed at each location?

Answer 131B:

No DAC is spelled out in the contract for start of PVT Training. The start date will be based on a firm date for start of the PVT. Once known, training will be scheduled so as to be completed as close as possible to the start of PVT . It has to be done this way to negate

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

any learning decay on the part of the Test Players. The dates selected shall be as mutually agreed to between PAT&E, LOG, the Contractor and the Test Community.

Question 131C:

What is the scope of effort for this required training?

Answer 131C:

It should concern the contractor ECP changes. All training will be directed at new technology insertions that impact the current knowledge base for Army operators and mechanics. Some examples would be:

- *safety impacts for the operator*
- *new controls for the operator*
- *system interfaces (electric/hydraulic/pneumatic)*
- *remove & replace procedures for drive line components*
- *computer aided diagnostics procedures*

Training for PVT will be limited to DS level task training, if required. Training for I&KPT will be through DS level and, if required, GS level.

Question 132, Reference Draft RFP Section C, Paragraph # C.2.10.7

Title: Limited User Test (LUT) Training

Question 132:

When is the LUT training to be conducted?

Answer 132:

See the FMTV Integrated Test Program Schedule. LUT training will be conducted shortly before the LUT, on a date mutually agreed to between PAT&E, LOG, the Contractor and the Test Community.

Question 224, Reference: Attachment 22, 4.d

“The replenishment spare price will be derived using the following two sources in this order of precedence: 1) a DOD supply system price (from the Army Master Data File

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

(AMDF) or other appropriate Government source), 2) the evaluated price for the Offeror's Unique Spares Future Optional Contract."

Without question, the Army Master Data File is a salient source of price information. It would be reassuring to learn that, in using the AMDF, the government intends to do sufficient research to satisfy itself that the price used is a fair and representative price.

Answer 224 (Revised): *To ensure fairness to both Offerors, the Government intends to perform sufficient research on this subject. Additionally, Offeror's Unique Spares Future Optional Contract prices will be evaluated in the Contract Price Area, see paragraph L.4.3.5 of the draft RFP.*

Question 266, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.3.5.1

Title: Technical Manual – STS

Statement:

Para C.3.5.1 states that updates to the Technical Manuals resulting from Government furnished ECPs will be accomplished through the work directive.

Question 266A:

How many DAC will the Government issue work directives for Government furnished ECPs?

Answer 266A:

The plan is for a work directive to be issued at the time of contract award for Government furnished ECPs, any needed corrections, Expansible Van, and possibly LHS, to be added into the manuals to support fielding.

Question 278, Reference ATPD , Page 16

Paragraph # 3.3.1.1

Title: Component Ratings and Specifications

Statement:

Para. 3.3.1.1 was revised from the Phase I requirement to say: "All system components shall be rated and approved by component manufacturer for vehicle application. Existing

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

ratings and specifications shall not be raised nor changed with the intention to meet the requirements of this specification.”

Question 278A:

Is there any component in the Government TDP that currently falls into this category?

Answer 278A: *To the best knowledge of the Government, there are currently no items in the TDP that fall into this category. The language was modified for Phase II to preclude any future incidence.*

Question 278B:

If there are TDP components in this category, will the government identify them and then direct the Phase II winner to correct the deficiency as an STS effort following contract award?

Answer 278B: *In the event a component of the baseline TDP is, at a later date, found to fall into this category, any change to the item/TDP would be a result of an STS effort.*

Question 279, Reference ATPD, Paragraph # 3.4.1.2

Title: Heavy-Duty Cooling System

Statement:

ATPD para 3.4.1.2 states: “The cooling system will be tested to verify it meets the following requirements:

- a. Maintains the specified component operating temperatures within the specified limits while operating continuously at full load and 0.6 tractive effort to gross vehicle weight ratio (TE/GVW) while under maximum conditions of 120° F for all variants with the exception of the Tractor and Wrecker which shall meet a minimum of 0.55TE/GVW while under the maximum conditions of 120° F.”

The GVW of the Wrecker taken from ATPD 2131B, Attachment 41, is 34,683 lbs.

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 279:

To keep the cooling performance requirement consistent between variants it is suggested that the following variants (which have GVW's equal to or greater than that of the Wrecker) be required to meet the cooling requirements at 0.55TE/GVW.

VARIANT	GVW (lbs)
LWB Cargo w/MHE	36,679
Expansible Van	37,276
Expansible Van W/W	38,253
Dump W/W	(weight with mod kit unknown)

Additionally, if either the HIMARS support vehicle and/or the LHS have GVW's in excess of 34,683 lbs, then they too should be added to the above list.

Answer 279: *The M1087A1 Expansible Van, with and without winch, and the LWB Cargo w/MHE will be added to the list of vehicles for which the 0.55 TE/GVW requirement applies. As the current requirement for the Dump variants is also 0.06 TE/GVW and the weight of the modified Dump is not known at this time, there are no plans to change the requirement applicable to that variant at this time. If, in the future, weight growth of the Dump puts it in the same GVW range as the M1086, M1087, M1088, and M1089, we will relook the situation and adjust the requirement accordingly, if necessary.*

Question 282, Reference ATPD, Page 25

Paragraph # 3.4.16

Title: Wheel Splash and Stone Throw Protection

Statement:

The TDP states that "Protection to the rear against rear wheel splash and stone throw shall include anti-sail mud flaps that will not be lifted up by high speed air flow and be in accordance with SAE J682."

Question 282A:

Can the Government confirm that the baseline TDP mud flaps meet the SAE J682 anti-sail requirements?

Answer 282A: *The Government is unaware of any nonconformance of the TDP mud flaps to the requirements of SAE J682.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 282B:

Can the Government confirm that the baseline mud flaps have performed to an acceptable level and should be purchased to the existing TDP for Phase II production contract?

Answer 282B: *No deficiency in the performance of the existing TDP mud flaps has been identified to date.*

Question 283, Page 50

Paragraph # 4.7.38

Title: Engine Examination/Certification

Statement:

Para 4.7.39 states that the contractor shall certify that the engine has passed the NATO 400-hour standard engine test, AEP-5,... This is an existing specification required for the current contract. According to Caterpillar, this test was never performed for the current contract. It is assume that the requirement was waived.

Question 283A:

Was this requirement waived?

Answer 283A: *Yes, the requirement was waived based on information provided by the engine vendor that showed their engine had successfully completed vendor testing and that their durability testing was an acceptable substitute for the NATO 400-hour test.*

Question 283B:

If the requirement was not waived, is the engine certified to meet the specification?

Answer 283B: *See 283A above.*

Question 283C:

If the requirement was waived, will the TDP be updated to eliminate this requirement?

Answer 283C: *No. Due to the changes to the engine to meet EPA emissions standards the engine will have to be certified. This may require a 400-hour NATO test or comparable vendor testing.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 283D:

Can a copy of either the certification or waiver be provided?

Answer 283D: *Not necessary as the new Competitive Rebuy engine will have to be re-certified.*

Question 284, Reference ATPD, Page 52

Paragraph # 4.7.54

Title: Wheels, Rims, and Tires

Statement:

SAE J2104 is a new standard added to this revision of the ATDP at this paragraph. SAE J2104 is not related to wheels and tires. It is titled "Acoustics—Measurement of Exterior Noise Emitted by earthmoving machinery—Dynamic Test Conditions". SAE J2014 "Pneumatic Tires for Military Tactical Wheeled Vehicles" is a new standard referenced in paragraph 2.3.1 – Commercial or Industry Standards and Publications.

Question 284:

Is the addition of SAE J2104 an error in paragraph 4.7.54, and is SAE J2014 the intended specification?

Answer 284: *Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Yes, the correct SAE Specification in paragraph 4.7.54 is SAE J2014. The upgraded specification that will accompany the final RFP package will reflect the correction.*

Question 285, Reference ATPD, Page 75

Title: Expansible Van

Statement:

The Expansible Van component drawings in the TDP indicates significant interference between the storage rack p/n 12443567 and the air cleaner p/n 12443581. It appears that parts manufactured IAW these drawings will not fit as an assembly.

Question 285A:

Has the design been verified to be correct and do the parts fit as an assembly?

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Answer 285A:

Drawings 12443567 and 12443581 cannot be interrelated dimensionally to show an interference. They are independent drawings and have no relationship to each other. Top drawing 87T0046 sheet 3 Zone E-6 shows adequate clearance.

Question 294, Reference Draft RFP, Paragraph # C.9.13.k and o

Title: Engineering Drawing Ordering Data

Line k states: "... multi-sheet drawings are revised by sheet, with the first sheet containing the latest revision level, and is revised when any sheet is revised.

Statement:

This method described has drawbacks.

It is our understanding Pro-E can not track the revision level via the parameter tables (parameter 24 as noted in FMTV-MODELING-STD-100T rev. B 4/10/02). If the revision level is placed in the parameter table, then all sheets will have the same revision level noted on them. To allow different sheet revision levels, a table must be placed on sheet one, and manually updated whenever a sheet is revised. Thus Pro-Interlink, or whatever PDM software is being used, will not be able to track the drawing revision level automatically.

Question 294:

Can the revision procedure be changed, with contract wording as follows:

- k. Revisions to multi-sheet drawings will follow ASME Y14.35M, paragraph 7.3, such that all sheets have the same revision level, and advance revision levels together.
- n. Add sheets using the next sequential whole number, per ASME Y14.35M, paragraph 7.5.1. Use method (a) when a sheet must be inserted between existing sheet numbers.
- o. When deleting sheets, the remaining sheets are renumbered sequentially, and revision block is updated with notations such as "sheet 2 was sheet 3" or "deleted sheet 3", per ASME Y14.35, paragraph 7.5.2 method (a).

Answer 294: *The Government is currently beta-testing the drawing release procedures. At this time, it is not known whether this capability currently exists, or whether*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

modifications will need to be made to the software to provide the capability. Once beta-testing is complete (currently projected for Dec 02), if results indicate so, the Government will consider implementing such a language change.

Question 305, Reference Draft RFP Section M, Page 129

Paragraph # M.1.1

Title: Arctic Kits

Statement:

Through other Government Programs, we have learned that the Army is phasing out the swing fire heater. The swing fire heater is a part of the FMTV arctic kit.

Question 305A:

What is the Army's time frame for phasing out this heater?

Answer 305A: *The Swing-fire heater unit has been phased out of the Army.*

Question 305B:

Is the Government working on a revision to the FMTV arctic kit?

Answer 305B: *Modifications have already been made and incorporated into the FMTV TDP. No further efforts are envisioned at this time.*

Question 305C:

If the answer to Question B is yes, when will details be provided to the competitors?

Answer 305C: *See Answer 305B above.*

Question 315, Reference ATTACHMENT 3 – ECP SSS-U5771

Statement:

During a review of the new small arms mount incorporated by ECP SSS-U5771, a few minor issues were noted. Additional information is needed on 12422843 to accurately model or draw this component. When the suggested source on the drawing (Insul-Fab) was contacted, they stated that the clip configuration was changing slightly to

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

domestically produce it. They also indicated that other components of this assembly might be changing.

Question 315A:

If changes to components of the small arms mount are forthcoming, when will details be provided to both competitors?

Answer 315A: *Any changes to the SSS-U5771 configuration will be incorporated through a follow-on ECP. The competitors will be notified of any configuration changes following Government approval of the follow-on ECP.*

Question 315:

Has a verification of these components been performed and if so can details be provided?

Answer 315B: *If the competitor is referring to the changes alluded to in the above statement, then no, to the Government's knowledge no verification of those components has taken place. The parts released under ECP SSS-U5771 were verified through fit-up tests during the kit development process. The Government has no knowledge that any changes to the kit are in process.*

Question 315C:

How was this ECP released without the design finalized?

Answer 315C: *The design was finalized at the time the ECP was approved in March 2002.*

Question 315D:

Since the vehicle baseline is now frozen, will the competitors be expected to submit an ECP that corrects these issues after the Government defines what needs to change with the small arms mount or installation or will the ECP be removed from the baseline TDP?

Answer 315D: *No, the competitors are not to submit ECPs to correct any perceived issues with the new small arms mount. As stated in Answer 315A above, the competitors shall be notified of any changes in the design of the small arms mount when and if any ECP is approved making such changes.*

**FMTV A1 CR DRAFT RFP
DAAE07-02-R-S134**

**QUESTIONS WITH ANSWERS
SET F**

6/18/02

Question 316, Reference: Attachment 1 ATPD Paragraph M1.10 and M.1.111

M.1.10 Trailer Tank and Pump Unit (TPU) Tiedown Kits. The M1095 MTVT shall be capable of accepting mounting kits for both the **525-gallon and 600-gallon TPU sets**. The kit numbers of the TPUs are 57K2018 and **57K2019 respectively**.

M.1.11 Digitization Kits. All FMTV variants shall be capable of supporting digitization efforts by accepting both the Digitization Rack Kit, 57K2012, and the **Digitization Electrical Kit, 57K2019**, within the cab of the vehicle.

The kit number 57K2019 is used to identify two different kits. Please clarify.

Answer 316: *Please refer to Answer 251A. The correct kit number for the Digitization Electrical Kits is 57K2013.*